

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 23, 2008. Claims 1-17 and 48-53 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 8 and 13 are in independent form. Claims 1, 7, 8, 12, 13, 17, 48, 50 and 52 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,078,308 (Rosenberg et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 6,219,053 (Tachibana et al.), and Claims 48-53 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over those two patents and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,867,164 (Bornstein et al.).

As described in the specification, it is common to have various “devices such as personal computers (PC), printers, scanners, digital copying machines and digital cameras” in a network, such as a LAN, where “each device... is installed in many cases at a remote site in [the] network environment” (paragraphs [0004] and [0006]). These devices are shared by all users who have access to the network.

The present invention has been made to enable the users to effectively utilize the devices in the network by properly combining them through a graphical user interface (GUI). For example, when a copier is not available, a scanner and a printer may be used in sequence to achieve the same copying function (paragraph [0119]). According to the present invention, a user can make this happen simply by graphically connecting an icon representing an appropriate scanner with an icon representing an appropriate printer.

Rosenberg concerns efficiently displaying cursor movement to a user with respect to a graphical object of interest on a display device in response to the user's operating an input device. The Office Action states that *Rosenberg* discloses a data processing apparatus capable of data communications with various devices connected with a network. The Examiner appears to read *Rosenberg* as using user object 12 and other input (devices) 228 in Fig. 3 to represent some of the various devices connected with a network.

As Applicant understands, a user object 12 is a user manipulable object, such as a mouse (*see* col. 4, lines 50-60), and other input devices 228 can include buttons on a mouse (*see* col. 13, lines 46-50). Both of these are part of a (typical) one-machine setup, where a host processor (180 in Fig. 3) is connected with various input devices, such as a mouse (12 and 228), and output devices, such as a CRT monitor, through local buses (and input devices might be coupled with their own microprocessors (200)). In other words, *Rosenberg* does not involve a network with various devices connected to it. It certainly does not concern the various types of peripheral devices, such as scanners and printers, described in the specification.

Therefore, *Rosenberg* does not disclose "A data processing apparatus capable of data communications with various devices, including a PC and a peripheral device, connected with a network," as recited in Claim 1.

The Office Action further states that *Rosenberg* discloses a function setting screen displaying unit configured to display a setting screen for setting a combination function achievable by combining a first device and a second device respectively

corresponding to the icons designed by said designation unit. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is not clear to Applicant what in *Rosenberg* the Examiner considers as these first and second devices and their respective icons. Since the Examiner appears to refer to a mouse as a device connected to a network, there might be a cursor representing the mouse. Even if the cursor could be considered as an icon, however, a second icon representing the second device is still missing.

Applicant notes again that a “combination function” achievable by combining devices means a single function, such as copying, which can be implemented by using in sequence two devices, such as a scanner and a printer in the network. It is also not clear to Applicant what in *Rosenberg* the Examiner considers as the combination function. The Examiner appears to discuss “commanding a cursor to target icons” in *Rosenberg*, but Applicant frankly does not see how this relates to combining two devices to achieve one function by connecting their respective icons in the GUI.

Therefore, *Rosenberg* also does not disclose “a function setting screen displaying unit configured to display a setting screen for setting a combination function achievable by combining the first device and the second device respectively corresponding to the icons designated by said designation unit such that the output from the first device is used as the input to the second device,” as recited in Claim 1.

Tachibana does not remedy the deficiency discussed above. While it may involve a network with devices connected to it, *Tachibana* does not concern combining one device with another to achieve a desired function in any way, not to mention doing so by manipulating icons representing these devices.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be patentable over *Rosenberg* and *Tachibana*, considered separately or in any permissible combination.

Independent Claims 8 and 13 are method and computer-medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FGHS_WS 2640686v1